

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| United States of America, |) | C.A. No. 4:08-029-TLW-TER |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | ORDER |
| |) | |
| \$36,110.00 in United States Currency, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

The Plaintiff brought this in rem civil forfeiture action pursuant to Supplemental Rule G(2), Fed.R.Civ.P. On March 10, 2008, Sherrod Bright filed a *pro se* motion to dismiss the forfeiture action.

This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed February 2, 2009, by United States Magistrate Judge Tom Rogers, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that Bright’s motion to dismiss be denied. Bright has not objected to the Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th

Cir. 1983).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and has concluded that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 28), and Bright's motion is denied (Doc. # 9).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

March 12, 2009
Florence, South Carolina